

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and further examination in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

In the outstanding Office Action claims 1 - 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,625,757 to Kageyama et al.

By this response and amendment, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite that the plurality of image formation units are used in parallel to improve printing speed and that the transportation unit transports printed sheets from each of the plurality of image formation units to a common output location.

Support for these amendments is found in Figs 1 and 5 and pages 11 – 12 of the original specification. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not introduce any new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 132.

### **Rejections of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,625,757 to Kageyama et al.

### **Response**

Independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite that the plurality of image formation units are used in parallel to improve printing speed and that the transportation unit

transports printed sheets from each of the plurality of image formation units to a common output location.

For a reference to be anticipatory, each limitation of the claimed invention must be present in the cited reference, either explicitly or inherently. The Kageyama et al. reference does not show all of the limitations as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 7.

The present invention, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 7, is directed to a printing machine (claim 1) and to a method of reporting an error in the printing machine (claim 7). The printing machine comprises a plurality of image formation units used in parallel for printing an image data and improving the speed of the printing machine, an error detection unit to detect an error occurring in the printing machine, and a computer readable ROM having a classified error table stored therein in which errors that can occur in the printing machine are classified. After the parallel image formation units have printed images, the sheets are transported to a *common* output location.

The Kageyama et al. reference discloses a system consisting of a plurality of terminal equipment and a plurality of discrete printers connected to a network and controlled by a print server. Kageyama et al. do not teach a printing machine having a plurality of image formation units therein; and do not teach transportation of sheets printed by each of the plurality of image formation units to a common output location. Furthermore, Kageyama et al. do not teach a plurality of image formation units arranged in parallel to improve the speed of the printing.

The Examiner states that a “common output location” would be inherent to the disclosed printers. A common output location as recited in amended claim 1 is simply not shown and is

not inherent because the Kageyama et al. printers are not part of a singular printing machine but are instead discrete printers located remote from each other and distributed on a network. (See e.g. col. 3, lines 53 – 56; col. 11, lines 18 –57.) Thus, it does not follow that a common output location is taught by the cited reference. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the cited prior art. Consequently, it is submitted that claims 2-6 and 9, which ultimately depend from claim 1 and claim 8, which ultimately depends from claim 7, are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reason that respectively claim 1 and claim 7 are patentable thereover.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS**

The references cited by the Examiner have been reviewed and it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 7 as previously submitted and as herein amended and resubmitted, and dependent claims 2-6 and 8-10 are patentable thereover.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,  
**NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC**

Date: December 8, 2003

By:

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC  
1030 Fifteenth Street, N.W.  
Sixth Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 775-8383

  
Gary M. Nath  
Registration No. 26,965  
Marvin C. Berkowitz  
Registration No. 47,421  
Derek Richmond  
Registration No. 45,771  
Customer No. 20529